

man, when it is seen that both new curriculum and old permit him to take French and German all through instead of Greek, and that both new curriculum and old tell him he must take either French *or* German in the first and second year whether he takes Greek or not.

Since the discussion began the aspect of the question has been completely changed and complicated by the action of the Senate last month. A statute, introduced by Professor Hutton, was then passed, by which, in all four years of the course, pass Greek is made equal to French plus German. If my readers will turn back to p. 162 they will see what a preposterous equivalence this is for the fourth year. It is equally so in the lower years. As the curriculum stands at the present moment, taking the whole four years, we get contrasts like the following: 565 pp. of Greek texts = 4,170 pp. French and German texts; Abbott's Arnold's Exercise Book = Original French Composition + the translating of English to French + the translation of English to German; easy sight Greek (with vocabularies) = translation of any modern French + translation of any modern German. The power to understand French and German, when read, and the outlines of the history of literature are not balanced by anything in Greek, even in name. But nothing, I think, makes the pretended equivalence quite so absurd as the contrast in lectures already referred to—five in pass Greek, eighteen in pass French and German.

These contrasts, absurd as they may seem, are perhaps not the worst feature of the present situation. Since at least the year 1857, and continuously up to the present time, the curriculum has said that no pass man should get the degree of B.A. without at least two years study of a modern language, whether taking Greek or

not. For a considerable period not merely two but four years' study of a modern language was demanded. This principle was at that early date deliberately laid down. The reasons for doing so, given in a convocation speech by Rev. Dr. McCaul, then President, part of which I quote, are as sound to-day as they then were, and one can only wonder at the breadth of view and progressiveness of those earlier times in such painful contrast with the counsels which now prevail. He says: "The objection limits itself to the Modern Languages and the Natural Sciences. Now, in the first place, I would state that we have added only those subjects which, within the last few years, have made the greatest progress and the utility of which has been so universally recognized that they are essential elements of a good education (applause). Is it desirable that we should send forth our graduates without any knowledge of those modern languages, which are now so important?" (Professor Hutton and the Senate say now that we should do so.) "There is no scholar who omitted to acquaint himself with the modern languages, but who has had cause for deep regret. What scholar, for example, ignorant of the German, in which the very highest thoughts within the range of human intellect are to be found, but has suffered from the loss?" and more in the same strain. This principle, so wisely laid down, has been adhered to continuously for upwards of thirty-five years. But the Senate, by its recent action under Professor Hutton's direction, reverses all this and turns the hands back on the dial so that they now point to the year of grace 1857 or earlier. Inside the Senate and outside of it, the educational public has been deploring for years the disgracefully low pass standard, and yet the Senate has now further reduced that standard. On this ground alone,